REMARKS

In response to the Examiner's restriction requirements, Applicants hereby elect the claims of Groups 1-4 (claims 2-7 and 17) with traverse. The action further requested an election of species. Applicants hereby elect SEQ ID NO: 17, which refers to the polynucleotide sequence of the intronic Jβ2.3 gene sequence encoding peptide: MGLSAVGRTRAESGTAERAAPVFVLGLQAV. The species is read upon by claims 1, 2, 7, 13, 14, and 15.

The Examiner alleges that there are a large number of different inventions in the present application. Applicants respectfully disagree.

First, the present invention relates to novel T cell receptors lacking V region sequences. In contrast to the Examiner's comment that polynucleotides of the present invention "have a materially different structure", these polynucleotides are structurally related due to the absence of the V region sequences as well as the presence of intronic sequences not normally present in the known transcripts or gene products of T cell receptors. Since the polynucleotide molecules of the present invention share a general inventive concept, i.e., novel T cell receptors lacking a V region and the novel features thereof, they belong to a single invention. As such, Groups 1-4 (claims 2-7 and 17), Groups 5-37 (claims 6 and 8-11) and Group 38 (claim 6), which all recite polynucleotides lacking V region sequences, should be examined together.

Second, claim 19 (Groups 39-74) and claim 16 (Group 115), which recite peptides encoded by the polynucleotides claimed in claims 2-11 and 17, are related to the polynucleotide claims by virtue of claiming the same genetic information but in different forms. A proper prior art search for a peptide naturally includes the search for any known polynucleotide sequences that can encode the same, using, e.g., NIH translated database. Thus, the patentability of the peptide and the corresponding polynucleotide can be evaluated in the same prior art search. As such, no separate prior art search is required so that it presents no extra burden for the Examiner to consider the peptide and polynucleotide claims together. Therefore, the inventions classified by the Examiner as Groups 1-4 (claims 2-7 and 17), Groups 5-37 (claims 6 and 8-11), Group 38 (claim 6), Group 39-74 (claim 19) and Group 115 (claim 16), are indeed the same invention. Thus, claims 2-11, 16, 17 and 19 should be examined together at this time.

Process claims 22-25 are currently withdrawn but it is understood that they will be rejoined once the product claim 1, from which they depend, directly or indirectly, is allowed.

In view of the forgoing, the present application is not dividable as suggested by the Examiner and instead claims 2-11, 16, 17 and 19 are directed to a single invention which should be examined as a whole at this time. To do otherwise would be to ignore the teachings of the application as to what is inventive and instead limit the Applicants to elect each species of that invention.

Finally, the revised paper form of the sequence listing has been added to the specification before the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6-5-07

Allan A. Fanucci (Reg. No. 30,256)

WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
CUSTOMER NO. 28765
(212) 294-3311